

COMPARISON OF THE CREEDS

4

OF THE

Catholic and Roman Catholic Churches.

A SERMON

PREACHED IN ST. PAUL'S CHURCH, WEST GWILLIMBURY,

ON SUNDAY, 17TH AUGUST, 1862,

ON THE OCCASION OF THE

RECEPTION OF A CONVERT FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME.

BY THE

REV. JOHN FLETCHER, A.M.,

INCUMBENT OF BRADFORD, AND WEST GWILLIMBURY.

---

TORONTO:

HENRY ROWSELL, KING STREET.

1862.

COMMISSION OF THE CHIEFS

OF THE

OF THE CHIEFS OF THE CHIEFS

A. B. C. D. E. F. G. H. I. J. K. L. M. N. O. P. Q. R. S. T. U. V. W. X. Y. Z.

THE CHIEFS OF THE CHIEFS

THE CHIEFS OF THE CHIEFS

THE CHIEFS OF THE CHIEFS

THE CHIEFS OF THE CHIEFS

THE CHIEFS OF THE CHIEFS

THE CHIEFS OF THE CHIEFS

THE CHIEFS OF THE CHIEFS

TORONTO

HERALD PUBLISHING HOUSE

# COMPARISON OF THE CREEDS OF THE CATHOLIC AND ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCHES.

"Thus saith the Lord, Stand ye on the ways and see and ask for the old paths, which is the good way, and walk ye in it, and ye shall find refreshment for your souls."

*Jeremiah, vi., 16.*

Before commencing the consideration of the subject of which notice has been given, I think it necessary to acquaint the congregation that the book which I hold in my hand, and from which the text has been taken, is not that from which I usually preach. This is the Douay Bible, not the authorised version. I take my text from this version because I consider that on an occasion like the present it is only reasonable to suppose that there may be Roman Catholics in the Church, and I wish them distinctly to understand that we do not treat their version with disrespect, but on the contrary, esteem it (with the exception of the Apocrypha) as a translation of the sacred records, though not as correct, as simple, or as intelligible as the authorised version; and further, that they may be enabled to perceive, that in discussing with them the differences between our respective churches, we are not afraid to meet them upon their own ground, and to shew from their own version of the scriptures that the peculiar doctrines of their church are false and unscriptural. I mention this circumstance for the information of the members of my own congregation also, for as I trust that they are all acquainted with the Book of God, they may perceive a trifling difference in the text as read to them and as they know it to be in their own Bibles, and may possibly mistake the reason of this difference. I desire that between me and my people there should be no misapprehensions or differences, but that as they know the ground of my actions they may be able to appreciate my motives, and co-operate with me in the work which as churchmen we have in hand. Any other passage of Scripture that I shall think it my duty to quote in support of the several principles I may lay down, shall be also taken from the Douay Bible.

Having made this preliminary explanation, I shall now proceed to the discussion of the subject appointed for our consideration on this occasion.

It has always been the practice of the church of which I have the honour to be a minister, to support her ceremonies, her discipline, and her doctrines upon their agreement with the sacred records, and after these upon their conformity with the concurrent voice of antiquity. She does not fear a reference to the judgment of the primitive church. She courts such a judgment. The following is her language upon this point: "If they think much that any of the old [ceremonies] do remain, and would rather have all denied

anew, then such men granting some ceremonies convenient to be had, surely where the old may well be used, there they cannot reasonably reprove the old only for their age without learning of their own folly. For in such a case they ought rather to have reference unto them for their antiquity if they will declare themselves to be more studious of unity and concord than of innovations and newfangledness, which (as much as may be with true setting forth of Christ's religion) is always to be eschewed."\* In following this course she treads in the footsteps of the primitive church, if we may judge what these were from the following language of a writer who lived in the latter part of the second century: "This rule holds good against all heresies. That which is first is true, that which is more modern is corrupt."† It is in this way that she meets all opponents. She claims to be the old church, the true church, the catholic church; and she says to all other claimants to that position, "Stand ye on the ways and see, and ask for the old paths which is the good way, and walk ye in them." I shall therefore take this course in the examination of my subject, and I trust that I shall make it perfectly plain to all sincere enquirers that the creed of the church is ancient and Catholic, and the creed of the church of Rome is a modern innovation, uncatholic and unscriptural.

I must first, however, prepare the way by explaining to you what I mean by ancient and catholic. By ancient I do not understand that which can claim the existence merely of a few centuries, or even of a thousand years, but that which can look back to the very beginning of our dispensation, to the time when Christianity sprang forth pure and perfect from the hands of its Author, through the instrumentality of His apostles and prophets, not to the fathers only, (by which title I mean the catholic writers of the first six centuries,) but to the fathers of the fathers, the prophets, the apostles and the evangelists by whom God was pleased to make known unto us the way of salvation. We are so much in the habit of hearing the Church of Rome boast of her age that we are almost disposed to yield to her the palm of antiquity, but this course is altogether wrong; the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome are not ancient; they are modern corruptions, indeed the confirmation of those doctrines is of a later date than the confirmation of her own creeds by the Church of England. This assertion may appear strange to the Roman Catholic members of this congregation, but it is strictly and literally true. The Articles of the Church of England were agreed upon in the year 1562, exactly 300 years ago. In these articles it is said that "The three creeds, Nicene Creed, Athanasius's Creed, and that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, ought thoroughly to be received and believed, for they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy scripture.‡ The creed of the Council of Trent which contains the confirmation of the doctrines of the Church of Rome, was published by authority of Pope Pius IV. in the year 1564, consequently the Church of Rome in its state of consolidated error, is two years younger than the Church

\* Preface to the Book of Common Prayer, "Of Ceremonies, why some be abolished, and some retained."

† Tertullian, A.D. 194, Adv. Prax., Cap. 2.

‡ Article 8th.

of England in its state of completed reform. This may, however, appear to some in the light of a quibble. I shall therefore proceed further, and prove that the creeds of the Church of England are those of the primitive church, and that consequently she is the ancient, the Catholic Church, but that the latter portions of the creed of Pope Pius the fourth, containing the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome, are modern innovations, and therefore uncatholic.

The term catholic conveys to my mind not only the idea of universal reception, but also of purity of doctrine and worship—universal or rather general reception alone will not constitute catholicity, for if it did, Arianism, which once over-spread the face of the Christian world, would have been the Catholic Church, but this neither the Roman Catholic nor the orthodox Protestant will allow; we must consequently look for some other mark by which we can decide upon the nature of the true Catholic Church, and a little examination of the writings of the fathers of the early churches will enable us to discover what those marks are. "That church alone" (says one) "is catholic which retains the true worship of God."\* We claim for the Church of England that her worship is true without any admixture of error. We therefore assert that she is catholic. On the other hand we say that in the worship of the Church of Rome there are certain things from which the primitive church turned away with complete abhorrence; that her worship in these respects is not true, and therefore that she is not catholic. "That which has been believed every where" (says another) "at all times and by all Christians, that is truly and properly catholic, which the force and very reason of the name declare."† The creeds of the Church of England stand this test, they are therefore catholic—the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome as contained in the 12 last articles of the creed of Pope Pius IV. do not stand it, they are therefore false and uncatholic.

But my Roman Catholic friends may say "this is mere assertion. We require something more than this to satisfy our minds that the faith of our fathers is false, and that the claim that our church puts forth to be the only true catholic church is a base and unfounded assumption." I shall now proceed to the proof of the positions that I have laid down, and in doing so it will be necessary to take a short review of the history of the use of creeds in the church.

At first the candidate for the privilege of Christian baptism was required to testify to his belief in but few of the great doctrines of Christianity; when the faith was pure and heresy had not introduced its poison into the beauteous form of the body of Christ, the simple expression of the acknowledgment of belief in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit was considered sufficient to admit the professor of it to the Christian communion, but by degrees errors crept in, and it was found necessary to counteract these errors by the enlargement of the formula of belief. In this way during the lifetime of the apostles, or in the immediately succeeding age, that form of faith was composed which goes under the name of the Apostles' Creed. We have the most satisfactory evidence that in the

\* Lactantius, A.D. 306, Div. Instit., Lib. 4, Cap. 30.

† Vincent of Lerins, A.D. 434, Commonit., adv. Hæres.

second century of the Christian era it was used in the admission of Catechumens to baptism, and in certifying to the orthodoxy of persons who had been elected to the sacred office of bishops in the Church of God. This form was found sufficient to answer these ends until the beginning of the fourth century, when heresy of a new kind appeared—an individual \* had then the boldness to teach that the Son of God, the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, was not in reality divine, that he was only the first of creatures. To counteract the evil effects of this false teaching a council was convened which met at Nice in the year 325, and put forth an exposition of the faith of Christians, almost in the words of that form which I have just recited to you from the Lord's table, and which goes under the name of the Nicene Creed. In this form the supreme divinity of the Son was clearly expressed, so that no person could be called a Catholic Christian who would deny that Jesus Christ was in the highest sense God; but there was not the same precision manifested with respect to the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. The formula, as put forth by that council, terminated with the words, "And in the Holy Ghost." After a short time another form of heresy presented itself which pretended to acquiesce in the truth of the doctrine of the Nicene Creed, but denied the divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost; another council was thereupon called to settle this point, which met at Constantinople in the year 381, and enlarged the creed into its present form, with the exception of a single word, † which was afterwards added to it, and which contains a perfectly true and scriptural doctrine. This creed thus put forth in its shorter form by the first General Council at Nice, and published in its more complete and perfect form by the second General Council at Constantinople, is the Catholic Creed, and that church which holds to it alone without addition or diminution, is the Catholic Church; and the Church which has added to its articles doctrines that were not known when it was composed is not catholic.

After the lapse of another half century, the circumstances of the church required that another General Council should be convened, which met at Ephesus, in the year 431, and after considering the formula of the Church's faith, issued the following decree: "The holy synod decreed that it should be lawful for no one to profess, to write, or to compose any other form of faith than that defined by the holy fathers who with the Holy Ghost had been assembled at Nice. But they who shall have dared to compose or to profess, or to offer any other form of faith to those wishing to be converted to the acknowledgment of the truth, whether from Paganism or from Judaism, or from any sort of heresy; if they were bishops or clergymen, the bishops should be deposed from their episcopacy, and the clergy from their clerical office, but that if they were laymen they should be subjected to an anathema." ‡

\* Arius, Circ., A.D. 315. The doctrine of the mere humanity of the Saviour had been previously broached by Theodotus, the tanner, about the year A.D. 200. This individual was excommunicated for his heresy by Victor, Bishop of Rome, and the notion remained dormant until it was resuscitated by Arius, as mentioned above.

† Filioque, and from the Son.

‡ Canon 7.



Another General Council was convened in the year 451, which met at Chalcedon, and published a decree of concurrence in the formula of faith of the Nicene and Constantinople Councils in the following words:

"The Catholic faith delivered by the holy 318 fathers, (viz., at Nice,) and by the holy 150 fathers, (viz., Constantinople,) also by the other most holy and glorious fathers, (viz. at Ephesus,) we guard, and according to that we believe. The most reverend bishops exclaimed: No person makes any other exposition of faith. We neither attempt nor dare do so, for the fathers have taught, and in writings are preserved those things which have been set forth by them, and others than these we cannot speak. Those principles which are set forth are sufficient. It is not lawful to make any other exposition."\*

That is the catholic creed, which was commenced at Nice, completed at Constantinople, sanctioned at Ephesus, and confirmed at Chalcedon. These four councils are acknowledged as general by both Roman Catholics and Protestants, and their decrees are entitled to universal respect and obedience, and therefore the church that receives these decrees and holds to the verity of that creed is catholic, and the church that adds to them is not only un-catholic, but has brought upon herself the anathema of the third general council.

And not only do these four councils, which are acknowledged as general by the Churches of Rome and of England, establish and confirm the catholic faith, but other councils both provincial and so called general, whose authority is acknowledged by the Church of Rome but rejected by the Church of England, do also confirm it. Thus the council that met at Laodicea, in Thrace, A.D. 347, in the pontificate of Julius, and which was completely under his influence, declares that "Nothing more should be written touching the faith, but all should rest satisfied with the faith confessed by the Nicene fathers, because it was deficient in nothing."† The council of Ariminum, in Italy, A.D. 359, says "We are children of the Nicene fathers, but if we should dare to take away any thing from what they have written, or add any thing to it, we should be spurious children as being accusers of what they did who delivered an exact rule of faith."‡ The 2nd council of Constantinople, called by Roman Catholics the 5th General Council, ratifies that creed when its members declare "We have taken care that the foundation of faith may remain inviolate according to the tradition of the holy fathers."§ And what may appear strange the council of Trent, that very council which promulgated the new doctrines of Romanism, in one of its early sessions confirmed the Nicene Creed. The following are the words of the decree passed by the council for this purpose:—"In the name of the Holy and undivided Trinity, of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the holy oecumenical and general synod of Trent, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same three legates of the Apostolic See presiding in it, considering the magnitude of the subjects to be treated, especially of those contained under these

\* Apud Concil. Chal. Sess. 5. Bin. Concil. Tom. 8, p. 591.

† Apud. Athan. Epad. Antioch, p. 576.

‡ Apud. Theodoret Ecc. Hist. Lib. 2, Cap. 15.

§ Con. Const. Sub. Menon, Act 5, p. 87, Apud. Bin. Tom. 4.

two heads, the extirpation of heresies and the reformation of morals, on account of which chiefly it has been assembled, but acknowledging with the apostle that it has not to wrestle with flesh and blood, but with spiritual wickedness in heavenly places. With the same apostle it exhorts all and every one in the first place that they should be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might; in all things taking the shield of faith, by which they can quench all the fiery darts of the most wicked, and that they should take the helmet of the hope of salvation, with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. Therefore that this its pious solicitude may have its beginning and continuance by the grace of God it determines and decrees that before all things the confession of faith is to be premised, following in this the example of the fathers who in their sacred councils were accustomed to oppose this shield against all heresies in the beginning of their actions, by which alone they both sometimes drew infidels to the faith, vanquished heretics, and confirmed the faithful. Wherefore it (the council) commands that this creed, which the holy Roman Church uses as that summary in which all who profess the faith of Christ necessarily agree, and that firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, shall be read in those words in which it is read in all churches, which is as follows."\* Then the council recites the Nicene Creed as you have a short time since heard it recited from the Lord's table, and as you will find it in our Book of Common Prayer.

The Church of England agrees with the sentiment expressed by the fathers in the council of Laodicea, that the faith confessed by the Nicene fathers was deficient in nothing; with the members of the council of Ariminum she says that they delivered to us an exact rule of faith; with the 2nd council of Constantinople she has taken care that the foundation of faith should remain inviolate, and with the 3rd session of the council of Trent she believes that the truths set forth in the Nicene Creed are that firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. I may therefore, as one of her ministers, with the greatest propriety, make use of the language of Vincent of Lerins, a saint of the Roman calendar, and say "To teach any thing to catholic christians besides that which they have received, never is lawful, never has been lawful, never will be lawful, and to anathematize those who do teach any thing besides that which has been once for all received, was always a duty, is always a duty, and always will be a duty. Can there be any person either so bold as to wish to proclaim a new doctrine to the church, or so rash as to receive any other doctrine than that which he has already received from the church. The apostle Paul, that chosen vessel, that teacher of nations, that trumpet of the apostles, that herald of the whole earth, that witness of what passed in heaven, he speaking by means of his epistle directs his speech to all the faithful at all times and in all places, he, I say, once, yea twice, exclaims, "If any preach to you a new doctrine, let him be anathema."†

---

\* Concil. Trid. Sep. 3, (Feb. 4, 1546.)

† Commonit. Cap 14, p. 546, Mogunt 1602.



I must now proceed to discharge a much less agreeable duty than that in which we have been hitherto engaged; but I have undertaken to compare the creeds of the two churches, and must therefore point out those additions which render the creed of the Church of Rome uncatholic and unscriptural. Had that church been sincere in the expression of her faith, as put forth in the 3rd session of the council of Trent, had she believed only the doctrines contained in the confession of faith which she then recited, and had her practice been conformable to that profession, there had been no need of reformation; then had the church been in the enjoyment of that blessing of unity which she possessed when she came forth from the hands of her divine author. But she was not sincere in that profession, at the very time when she gave utterance to that formula she had floating around her a number of erroneous opinions to which she had not yet given embodiment and life. In that creed there was no reference to traditions, nor to the canonical character of the books of the Apocrypha, nor to the necessity of explaining scripture according to the unanimous consent of the fathers, nor to the seven sacraments, nor to justification by works, nor to transubstantiation, nor to communion in one kind, nor to purgatory, nor to prayers for the dead, nor to the worship of saints, nor to the honour of relics, nor to image worship, nor to indulgences, nor to the precedency of the Church of Rome, nor to the authority of councils, nor to the exclusiveness of salvation in the Church of Rome. All these errors had therefore to be concentrated into one form in order to give the appearance of vitality to the lifeless, shapeless mass of Romanism.

Its first effort to effect this object appears to have been made at the 4th council of Lateran, in the year 1215, nearly 900 years after the first promulgation of the shorter form of the Nicene Creed. She then, in defiance of the decree of the general council of Ephesus, dared to compose, to profess, and to offer to the christian world another form of faith than that which had been previously received. Here are her words:—"We believe firmly, and simply confess, that there is one only true God, eternal and immense, omnipotent, incommutable, incomprehensible, and ineffable, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three persons indeed, but one essence, substance or nature altogether simple, the Father from none, the Son from the Father alone, and the Holy Ghost from both, equally without beginning and without end, the Father generant, the Son nascent, the Holy Ghost proceeding, consubstantial and co-equal, omnipotent and co-eternal, the one beginning of all things, the Creator of all things invisible and visible, spiritual and corporal, who by his omnipotent power at once from the beginning made the creature of two kinds, the spiritual and corporal, that is to say, the angelic and the earthly, and afterwards the human as common to both, composed of spirit and body. For the devil and other demons were indeed created good by nature, but they became evil of themselves; man however sinned by the suggestions of the devil. This Holy Trinity as it respects common essence undivided, yet as it respects personal attributes distinct, did, through Moses and the holy prophets and his other servants, according to a most perfectly ordered disposition of times, concede to the human race a doctrine of salvation, and at

length the only begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, incarnate by the whole Trinity in common, conceived by Mary, ever a virgin by the co-operation of the Holy Ghost, made true man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh composed, one person in two natures, did make known more clearly the way of life, who, although as to his divinity he be immortal and impassible, yet he the very same did become as to his humanity passible and mortal. Nay for the salvation of the human race he suffered on the wood of the cross and died, descended into hell, rose from the dead, and ascended into heaven. He descended, however, in the spirit, he rose in the flesh, and he ascended in both together, about to come at the end of the world to judge the quick and the dead, and to render to each according to their works, whether they be reprobate or elect, who shall all rise with their own bodies, those which now they carry, that they may receive according to their deserts, whether they be good or bad—these with the devil perpetual punishment; and those with Christ eternal glory.”

Here I may pause to observe that if the Church of Rome had been satisfied to stop here, we might look upon this creed as an explanation of the previous creeds, expressed indeed in language too philosophical, and containing doctrines that are not in accordance with truth, but yet not of so dangerous a character as that a person holding them might despair of salvation; but she was not satisfied to do so, she had a short time before invented a new doctrine which required authoritative enactment, and she therefore proceeded to give by the sanction of a so called general council the force of law to the recently invented doctrine of transubstantiation, which was thus for the first time, A.D. 1215, expressly embodied among the articles of the Roman faith. She accordingly proceeds with her creed in the following terms:—

“Moreover there is one universal church, outside which none at all is saved, in which the same person is the priest and the sacrifice, even Jesus Christ, whose body and blood in the sacrament of the altar, under the externals of bread and wine, are truly contained, the bread being by divine power transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood, that in order to perfect the mystery of unity we may receive of his what he received of ours. And this sacrament none can effectuate but a priest duly ordained according to the keys of the church which Jesus Christ himself granted to his apostles and their successors. But the sacrament of baptism which, by the invocation of the undivided Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is consecrated in water, as well for infants as adults, when duly conferred by any person whatsoever in the form of the church, is profitable for salvation. And if after receiving baptism any one shall fall into sin, he can also be restored by true penitence. Moreover not merely virgins and the continent but married persons also who please God by right piety and good works deserve to attain to everlasting life.”\*

But this creed falls completely into the shade when compared with that put forth by the Council of Trent in the year 1564, which embodies in it nearly every one of the errors of the Church of Rome, and requires that these errors shall be believed as neces-

\* Labbeus et Cossart Tom. 11 pars 1, p. 142, Paris 1671.

sary to salvation. I shall now read to you this remarkable confession of faith, which is required to be observed and sworn to by all persons taking any office whatsoever in the Church of Rome:—

“I, N., believe and profess, with a firm faith, all and every one of the things which are contained in the symbol of faith which is used in the Holy Roman Catholic Church, viz.:—I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, &c. Here follows word for word, even including the Amen, the Nicene Creed which you have just heard me read from the Lord's table, after which the form proceeds:—

1. I most steadfastly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other observances and constitutions of the church.

2. I also admit the holy scriptures according to the sense which our holy mother the church has held and does hold, to which it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the scriptures; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers.

3. I also profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one, to wit., Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, and Matrimony, and that they confer grace, and that of these baptism, confirmation, and order, cannot be reiterated without sacrilege, and I also receive and admit the received and approved ceremonies of the Catholic Church used in the solemn administration of all the aforesaid sacraments.

4. I embrace and receive all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy council of Trent concerning original sin and justification.

5. I profess likewise that in the mass there is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, and that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there are truly, really and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also confess that under either kind alone Christ is received whole and entire, and a true sacrament.

6. I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful.

7. Likewise that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honoured and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be held in veneration.

8. I most firmly assert that the image of Christ, of the mother of God, ever virgin, and also of other saints, may be had and retained, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them.

9. I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to christian people.

10. I acknowledge the Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church for the mother and mistress of all churches; and I promise true

obedience to the Bishop of Rome, successor to St. Peter, Prince of the apostles, and vicar of Jesus Christ.

11. I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy council of Trent; and I condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies which the church has condemned, rejected, and anathematized.

12. I, N., do at this present, freely profess, and truly hold, this true catholic faith, without which no one can be saved; and I promise most constantly to retain and confess the same entire and inviolate, with God's assistance, to the end of my life. And I will take care, as far as in me lies, that it shall be held, taught, and preached by my subjects, or by those, the care of whom shall appertain to me, in my office. This I promise, vow, and swear, so help me God, and these holy gospels of God."

These twelve articles constitute the peculiar creed of the Church of Rome, they are a direct violation of the decree of the council of Ephesus, they are altogether opposed to the belief of the primitive church, they are directly contrary to the sacred scriptures, they are therefore not catholic, and the church that holds them is not the Catholic Church.

It would be absolutely impossible to condense into one discourse a thorough examination of the several errors contained in this creed, each article requires for its consideration more time than is generally allotted to the delivery of one or two sermons. I must therefore content myself with a brief glance at a few of the subjects that will occupy least time in their consideration, and shall select for this purpose tradition, the canon of scripture, the unanimous consent of the fathers, communion in one kind, and prayer to saints. The tests to which I refer these subjects are the voice of antiquity and the word of God; and remember, Roman Catholics, that the version which I am now about to quote is your own version, you cannot say that I am bringing against you a perverted translation, for this has been published by one of your own bishops, and has received his full sanction. Tradition is contrary to the word of God, for the Saviour himself reproved the Jews, who like the Roman Catholics had added to the written word their unwritten traditions. Hear what he says upon this subject, "Leaving the commandments of God you hold the tradition of men, the washing of pots and of cups, and many other things you do like to these. And he said to them, Well do you make void the commandment of God that you may keep your own tradition, for Moses said honour thy father and thy mother, and he that shall curse father or mother dying let him die; but you say if a man shall say to his father or mother Corban, (which is a gift,) whatsoever is from me shall profit thee; and further you suffer him not to do anything for his father or mother, making void the word of God by your own tradition which you have given forth." (Mark 7, 8, 10.)

Here the Saviour himself tells us that tradition makes void the word of God, it cannot consequently be proper to introduce it or to rest upon it. The same sentiment is expressed by the fathers of the primitive church. I shall now give you the opinion of one of

them, Cyprian, who lived in the year 250, and died a martyr for the truth, and is honoured as a saint in the Roman Calendar.

"From whence," says he, "is that tradition. Whether has it come down from the authority of the Lord and the gospels, or from the commands and letters of the apostles? For that those things which are written are to be done, God testifies and sets before Joshua, saying, 'The book of the law shall not depart out of thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do all things which are written therein.'"<sup>\*</sup>

Here is the language of another of the fathers, who is also a saint in the Roman Calendar, Basil the great: "It is a manifest falling away from the faith, and a charge of arrogance either to reject any thing of what is written, or to introduce any thing of what is not written."<sup>†</sup>

Tradition is therefore one of those things that cannot stand the test of Vincent of Lerins, which I gave you in a former part of this discourse. It has not been received every where, at all times, and by all Christians, it consequently is not catholic, and the church that has introduced and now rests upon it cannot be the Catholic Church.

You are aware that the Roman Catholic Church has received as canonical several books which she calls scripture, which are altogether rejected by Protestants. There is no question about the books of the New Testament. The only doubt is with regard to those books which she considers a portion of the Old. Here that rule with which I commenced my discourse is of the greatest advantage: "That which is first is true, that which is more modern is corrupt." Which is the first, which is the more modern? I shall answer this question in the words of Melito, a writer who lived in the year 170, and who devoted a good deal of attention to the consideration of the matter: "When I was in the East," says he, "and come to the place itself in which these things were formerly preached and done, I learned diligently the books of the Old Testament, and I send you a list of them subjoined beneath. These are the names, 5 books of Moses, Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua the son of Nun, Judges, Ruth, 4 books of Kings, 2 of Paralipomenon, the Psalms of David, the Proverbs of Solomon, which is also called Wisdom, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, Job, the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, the twelve prophets in one book, Daniel, Ezekiel, Ezra."<sup>‡</sup>

The Roman Catholic members of the congregation will, I doubt not, be greatly surprised to hear that in this the first Christian catalogue of the books of the Old Testament, not one of those which we call Apocryphal is enumerated, but that it contains all the books of our canon, and no others. The only differences between it and ours are, that the books are not arranged in the same order, and the 4 Books of Kings are called by us, 2 Books of Samuel and 2 Books of Kings; and the 2 Books of Paralipomenon are called the 2 Books of Chronicles. The next catalogue which comes to our hands is that of the Council of Laodicea, which met about the middle of the 4th century, and is exactly the same as that of Melito,

<sup>\*</sup> Ep. 74 ad Pompeium.

<sup>†</sup> De Fide Cap. 1, Tom. 2, p. 251, Bened. Ed.

<sup>‡</sup> Apud Euseb. Ecc. Hist. Lib. 4, cap. 26.



and of our church. As the canons of this council were received and confirmed by the General Council of Chalcedon, they are of universal authority, and according to the 11th additional article of the creed of the Council of Trent, should be undoubtedly received and professed.

I now come to the consideration of the interpretation of the scriptures according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Roman Catholics, such interpretation is altogether impossible; there is no such thing as unanimous consent of the Fathers on the interpretation of the Word of God. They differ upon this point as they do upon a great many others, and I defy the whole Roman Catholic world to produce such unanimity. I shall give you one or two instances of the manner in which the Fathers disagree upon the most important texts in the whole range of Romish controversy. Here is one passage: "And I say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—Matt. xvi. 18. On this passage Father Launoy, a celebrated Roman Catholic writer, gives 17 extracts from the writings of early Fathers, in which Peter is spoken of as the rock; 8 passages in which the church is said to be built on all the Apostles; 44 extracts in which the faith that Peter confessed is called the rock; and 16 passages which says that the Church is built upon Christ as the rock.\* Listen now to another instance of unanimity. The passage is usually adduced in support of the doctrine of purgatory and reads as follows: "Other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid which is Christ Jesus. Now, if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be manifest, for the day of the Lord shall declare it, because it shall be revealed in fire, and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon he shall receive a reward: if any man's work burn he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." 1 Cor. iii., 11-15. Cardinal Bellarmine tells us that in this text there are five difficulties—1. Who are the builders? 2. What are the materials? 3. What is the day of the Lord? 4. What is the fire that shall try the work? And, 5. What is meant by the expression, he shall be saved so as by fire. And on the first of these difficulties he gives two different opinions of early fathers: on the second he gives six, on the third two, on the fourth four, and on the fifth four.† Is this what the Council of Trent calls the unanimous consent of the fathers? I again repeat that such unanimity is impossible to be discovered, and that I defy the whole Roman Catholic world to produce it. Before I leave this passage I must call the attention of the Roman Catholics in this congregation to the first portion of it: "Other foundation no man can lay but that which is laid which is Christ Jesus." Remember that this is from your own version, and if the Douay Bible tells you that Christ Jesus is the only foundation, why do you rest upon the Virgin Mary, or the saints or angels, or those other numerous quicksands which your church directs you to build your hope upon? Had she

\*Launoi Opera, Tom. 5, part 2, p. 89, Epist. 7, Lib. 5, Gul Voello, Col. Allob. 1731.

† Dip. Ingolstadt, Tom. 1, cap. 4, De Purgatorio.

adhered to that only foundation there would now be no occasion to prove that she is uncatholic and unscriptural, and if she would now at last "look unto the rock whence you are hewn, and to the hole of the pit from which you are dug out" (Isaiah 5, 11, D.V.) we would receive her with open arms and gladly welcome her back to the faith once delivered unto the saints.

The next subject that I have marked out for our consideration is communion in one kind, which will require from me but very few remarks. You are aware that with us both the clergy and the laity receive the Lord's Supper under both its elements of bread and wine, but that in the Roman Catholic Church the clergy receive both elements, but the laity are robbed of one-half of the sacrament. Which of us is right? Which follows the true catholic custom? Listen to the language of the Council of Constance, the very council which at so late a date as the year 1414 robbed the laity of the Roman Catholic Church of their undoubted and scriptural right. "Christ did after supper institute this holy sacrament, and administered it to his disciples in both kinds of bread and wine."\* But you may say that the disciples to whom the first sacrament was administered were all clergy, and that consequently this is no proof of the right of the laity to receive the wine. Listen, then, to the same council on the point of the laity receiving the cup: "This sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds in the Primitive Church," and yet with the possession of this knowledge she dared to change the mode of the administration of the Lord's Supper nearly 1,400 years after its institution, during which period the whole church had received it as Christ had first administered it.

I shall now come to the proof of these assertions, and I will first read to you the account of the institution of the Lord's Supper as given in the 11th chapter of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians according to the Douay version, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you that the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread and giving thanks broke and said, take ye and eat, this is my body which shall be delivered for you, this do for the commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice after he had supped, saying, This is the New Testament in my blood, this do ye as often as you shall drink for the commemoration of me, For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord until he come. Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, but let a man prove himself and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice, for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself not discerning the body of the Lord." (1 Cor. xi., 23-29.) Will not the most uneducated amongst us at once perceive that the person who, according to this account, had the right to eat the bread had also the right to drink of the chalice, and that every man, not every priest merely, who proved himself might eat of the bread and drink of the chalice. I shall now give you a single quotation from

\* Concl. Constance, Sess. 13, Apud Labb. et Cossart. Tom. 12, p. 90, par. 1672.

one of the fathers of the early church upon this point. I might give you dozens, for in this matter the whole Catholic Church of the primitive ages is really unanimous, but the quotation I shall give is so strong upon the subject that it will preclude the necessity of giving more. You will observe that the individual whose language

shall now quote is deserving of attention, not only because he was one of the fathers, but because he was Pope of Rome, and is yet acknowledged as a saint in the Roman calendar, Pope Gelasius, who lived, A.D., 496. "We have discovered," says he, "that some persons who are said to be forced by I know not what superstition, take a portion of the sacred body only and abstain from the cup of the sacred blood, but let them either receive the entire sacrament or be kept away from the entire, because a division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege"\* No protestant could make use of stronger language. We may therefore say that the church which has dared to perpetrate this "great sacrilege" has in this respect also deprived herself of any claim to the title of the Catholic Church.

We now come to the last subject that I have marked out for our consideration--Prayer to saints. And will it be believed by the Roman Catholic members of the congregation that there is not a solitary legitimate example of prayer to saints throughout the whole of their Bible. There are three instances given in the index to that Bible of prayer to angels; but when we refer to the passages we find that in those places the being called by the name angel is no less a person than the Lord God of Hosts himself. I repeat there is not a solitary legitimate example of prayer to saints throughout the whole Douay Bible. There is however one and only one instance recorded there, and Roman Catholics I shall now read it for you. Judge for yourselves whether it is one that is worthy of your imitation: "There was a certain rich man who was clothed in purple and fine linen and feasted sumptuously every day, and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus who lay at his gate full of sores desiring to be filled with the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table and no one did give him; moreover, the dogs come and licked his sores. And it came to pass that the beggar died and was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom, and the rich man also died and he was buried in hell, and lifting up his eyes when he was in torments he saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom, and he cried and said, Father Abraham have mercy on me and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water to cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. And Abraham said to him, Son remember that thou did'st receive good things in thy life-time and likewise Lazarus evil things, but now he is comforted and thou art tormented, and besides all this, between us and you there is fixed a great chaos, so that they who would pass from hence to you cannot, nor from thence come hither. And he said, Then father I beseech thee that thou would'st send him to my father's house, for I have five brothers, that he may testify unto them lest they also come into this place of torments. And Abraham said to him, They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them; but he said, No Father Abraham, but if one went

---

\* Ap. Gratian. Decr. Can. Comperimus de Consecr. dist. 2, cap. 12.

to them from the dead they will do penance; and he said to him, if they hear not Moses and the prophets neither will they believe If one rise from the dead." (Luke 16, 19-21, D.V.) This is the only instance of prayer to a saint that can be found in the whole scriptures. And now I ask you as reasonable men is it one that you think deserves imitation? It was offered up in hell. The wretched being who gave utterance to it was a lost soul, and the return he received was a complete rejection of his prayer. Think of this before you again offer up a prayer to those who are unable to afford you any help.

I know that the generality of Protestants are not acquainted with the character of those prayers which are recommended to Roman Catholics in the authorized publications and private books of devotion. Here is a book compiled by a Roman Catholic priest and sanctioned by a Roman Catholic Archbishop—"What every Christian must know and do" by the Rev. J. Furniss, printed by Duffy the Roman Catholic bookseller of Dublin, and bearing upon its last page the following sanction, Imprimatur, Paulus Cullen, Archiepiscopus Dublinensis. Here is a sample from it of the nature of prayers to saints:

Heart of Jesus I adore Thee, Heart of Mary I implore thee;  
Heart of Joseph, pure and just. In those three hearts I put my trust.\*

But this prayer is orthodox compared with the following fearful specimen of blasphemy which is extracted from the Glories of St. Joseph, published by Grace, another Roman Catholic bookseller in Dublin.

"Most adorable Jesus, most admirable Mary, most amiable Joseph, wonderful Trinity of three persons, the most holy that ever have been or ever shall be in this world, prostrate at your feet in union of all the humility and devotion of heaven and earth, I hail, honour and love you in every way in my power. O, most desirable Jesus, O, most amiable Mary, O, most dear Joseph, I give myself up entirely to you—take possession of me for ever. O holy Trinity, I offer and consecrate to you the three faculties of my soul, O, Jesus, Mary and Joseph, most blessed Trinity, bless me with the triple benediction of the thrice holy Lord."† No language is sufficiently strong to express the feeling of intense abhorrence with which a true catholic views such a blasphemous address. The Trinity to whom he offers and consecrates the faculties of his soul is the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, but the Trinity to whom the Roman Catholic is directed by the Glories of St. Joseph to give himself up entirely is the adorable Jesus, the admirable Mary, the amiable Joseph. I shall now give you another extract from the same work which in its present form is extreme blasphemy, but which, if altered by the substitution of Jesus for Joseph would be pure and orthodox Christianity.

"Pius VII. by a rescript of the 6th of September, 1804, granted an indulgence of one year, applicable to the souls in purgatory, to all the faithful every time they would devoutly repeat the following

\* What every Christian, &c. Title page.

† Glories of St. Joseph. (Richard Grace, Dublin, 1853.) From the Christian's Pious Address to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.

hymn in honour of the Patriarch St. Joseph, the foster father of Jesus Christ, and the chaste spouse of the blessed Virgin Mary :

Whoever bless'd with health would spend  
Life's transient day, and calmly end  
That day without a fear,  
To Joseph let them turn their eyes,  
To Joseph let their prayers arise,  
And he their prayers will hear," &c. \*

These, then are some of the prayers which are offered by Roman Catholics to the saints departed. Do they in this matter act in accordance with the ancient Catholic Church? You may decide this point when you compare the quotations that I have read to you with the following extracts from the writings of Augustine, a saint in the Roman calendar, who is deservedly esteemed both by Catholics and Roman Catholics: "Let not our religion consist in the worship of dead men, because if they lived piously they are not esteemed such as would desire that kind of honour, but would have him to be worshipped by us by whose illumination they rejoice to have us partners with them in their merit. They are therefore to be honoured for imitation, not to be worshipped for religion."†

I have thus shewn you from these portions of the Creed of Pope Pius, the authorised creed of the Roman Catholic Church, that her practice is contrary to scripture, and in direct opposition to the usage of the ancient Catholic Church. Did my strength allow me to do so, or your time permit it, I would continue the consideration of the remaining portions, and shew from them that in those also she is uncatholic and unscriptural, but at present it is impossible that this can be done. What I have been able to bring before you is, however, sufficient to establish the position that I have laid down at the commencement of this discourse, that the Church of England in holding to the Catholic creeds without addition or diminution is the Catholic Church, but that the Church of Rome through her addition of 12 articles to the Nicene Creed at the Council of Trent, has brought upon herself the anathema of the General Council of Ephesus, and has deprived herself of all right and title to be considered catholic, or orthodox or scriptural.

In conclusion, remember, my Roman Catholic friends, that the old church is true catholic and scriptural, and that the new church is false, uncatholic, and unscriptural. Exercise your judgments: you are capable of using your reason in secular affairs, why do you not use it in religious matters? Examine which is the new church, which is the old. The soul is of too much value to be lost through resting upon the word of any fellow mortal, therefore judge for yourselves: "Stand ye on the ways and see and ask for the old paths, which is the good way, and walk ye in it, and you shall find refreshment for your souls." And now to God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, be ascribed, as is most due, all honour and glory, adoration and praise, world without end.—*Amen.*

\* Glories of St. Joseph. From the Hymns and Prayers in Honour of St. Joseph.

† De Vera Religione, Cap. 55, Tom. 1, p. 317.



er of  
y: 11

to 11  
also

also  
also

also  
also

oman  
et in

this  
you

aint  
h by

et in  
e not

have  
ee to

re to  
ope

her  
the

me  
tion

also  
ible

you  
laid

h of  
mi-

ugh  
l of

ncil  
on-

the  
rch

ts:  
you

ch,  
gh

for  
old

ind  
he

all  
—

St.